

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, Applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acknowledgement that the drawings are acceptable, and for the acknowledgement of Applicants' Claim for Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document in the Official Action.

Applicants additionally wish to thank the Examiner for considering the materials cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed in the present application on January 17, 2006, by the return of the signed Form PTO-1449 attached to the above-noted Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for considering the materials cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 16, 2006, by the return of a signed copy of the Information Disclosure Statement. It is noted that the documents cited in the May 16, 2006 Information Disclosure Statement were previously cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 17, 2006.

Upon entry of the amendment, claim 12 will have been amended. Claims 1-12 are currently pending for consideration by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by HENDRICKS et al. (U.S. Patent No.5,734,853). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, submitting that HENDRICKS fails to disclose each and every feature recited in claims 1-3 to justify an anticipation rejection.

With regard to independent claim 1, the Official Action asserts HENDRICKS' Figure 1 as disclosing a controlled device (220), a remote (900), and a transmission network (200). The

Official Action also asserts HENDRICKS' Figure 5a as disclosing that the controlled device (220) includes a storage section (628) that stores a channel table which associates broadcast station numbers with channel numbers, and HENDRICKS' Figure 14 as disclosing the channel table and a receiver.

Upon review, Applicants respectfully submit that HENDRICKS fails to disclose the remote controlling of a device through a network by a remote control device according to a user operation on a terminal at a remote place, since HENDRICKS remote (900) is a television remote control device that is situated locally with the controlled set top box and does not communicate with the controlled set top box using a network.

Applicants also wish to emphasize that the claimed remote control device is usually located at a different location from the controlled device. Thus, there exists the possibility that a specified channel setting fails when the area in which the remote control device is located is different from the area in which the controlled device is located. Accordingly, in order to solve this problem, a channel table is provided in the storage section of the controlled device that associates broadcast station numbers with channel numbers. Applicants submit that HENDRICKS fails to disclose a channel table as claimed. More particularly, Applicants submit that HENDRICKS fails to disclose a channel table that associates broadcast station numbers with channel numbers since HENDRICKS' Figure 14 just shows the displayed association of alphabetic channel descriptors with the channel numbers, and not the actual assigned numbers of broadcast stations. This distinction is important since the channel numbers associated with particular broadcast stations are frequently different depending on the geographical area, whereas the actual allocated broadcast station numbers are normally fixed.

Further, Applicants submit that HENDRICKS fails to disclose that his television remote control device uses the actual allocated broadcast station numbers, since HENDRICKS remote (900) uses the local area channel numbers to communicate with the controlled set top box. Applicants wish to emphasize that their claimed remote control device is not a television remote control and that the claimed remote control device is usually located at a different location from the controlled device.

With respect to dependent claim 2, as discussed above, Applicants submit that HENDRICKS fails to disclose a channel table that associates actual allocated broadcast station numbers (normally fixed), with channel numbers (that frequently vary dependent upon the geographical area), and broadcasting station frequencies, since HENDRICKS television remote control device only uses local channel numbers, not allocated broadcast station numbers.

In view of the distinct differences discussed above between the claimed invention and HENDRICKS, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this anticipation rejection, submitting that HENDRICKS fails to disclose each and every feature recited in claims 1-3.

Dependent claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over HENDRICKS et al. (U.S. Patent No.5,734,853) in view of HIROSE (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0217167 A1). Claim 4 is dependent upon claim 3, which is dependent upon independent claim 1. Accordingly, all of the arguments presented above with respect to the distinct differences between independent claim 1 and HENDRICKS also apply herein. Thus, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, submitting that the combination of HENDRICKS and HIROSE fails to render the claimed subject matter obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 5-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over HENDRICKS et al. (U.S. Patent No.5,734,853) in view of KUNII (U.S. Patent No. 7,095,402 B2). With regard to independent claim 8, the arguments presented above for independent claim 1 with respect to the distinct differences between the claimed subject matter, particularly the channel table, and HENDRICKS similarly applies herein.

Additionally, the Official Action acknowledges that HENDRICKS fails to disclose when a user operation related to a change in the channel table is performed on the terminal, reading the channel table from the controlled device by the remote control device to acquire a relationship between the broadcast station number, and changing the relationship on the basis of the user operation on the terminal to transmit the relationship to the controlled device, and updating the channel table in the controlled device on the basis of the relationship between the broadcast station number and the channel number transmitted from the remote controlled device. However, the Official Action asserts that KUNII's Figure 29 show a schematic view of a channel display on a remote terminal PDA that illustrates a channel list (301) from which the user selects the desired channel for display on the PDA's display unit. Upon review, Applicants respectfully submit that KUNII fails to teach that a separate remote control device distinct from the PDA terminal reads a channel table from a controlled device at a separate remote place from the PDA terminal, as required by Applicants' claims.

The Official Action also asserts that KUNII's Figure 21 teaches changing of the broadcast station number and channel number relationship on the basis of a user's operation on the terminal to transmit the relationship to the controlled device. Upon review, Applicants submit that KUNII's Figure 21 show a schematic view of a change window on a remote terminal PDA that is used to change the desired TV program acquisition information, including the

selection of region information, which is then stored on the PDA's present information memory (93). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that KUNII fails to teach changing of the broadcast station number and channel number relationship to a controlled device at a separate remote place from the PDA terminal.

The Official Action further asserts that KUNII's Figure 20 teaches updating a channel table in a controlled device on the basis of the relationship between the broadcast station number and the channel number transmitted from the remote control device. Applicants submit that KUNII's Figure 20 show a schematic view of a TV program information management screen on a remote terminal PDA that shows user selected dates for TV program information acquisition. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that KUNII fails to teach the updating of a channel table on the basis of the relationship between a broadcast station number and a channel number transmitted from a remote control device.

In view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, submitting that the combination of HENDRICKS and KUNII fails to render the subject matter of independent claim 8 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

With regard to dependent claims 5-7, which ultimately depend from independent claim 1, all of the arguments presented above with respect to the distinct differences between independent claim 1 and HENDRICKS also apply herein. With further regard for dependent claims 6-7, the arguments presented above with respect to KUNII similarly apply herein.

Claim 9 depends on independent claim 8, and is similar in scope to previously discussed claim 2. Thus, the discussion above regarding claim 2 similarly applies herein.

With regard to independent claim 12, the Official Action asserts that claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as stated for the corresponding method claim. Thus, the arguments

presented above similarly applies herein. Additionally, Applicants submit that the Official Action has never addressed the claim 12 limitation that recites that the remote control device's storage section stores multiple area channel tables. Applicants submit that neither HENDRICKS nor KUNII disclose or teach the provision and use of multiple area channel tables in the remote control device's storage section. Thus, Applicants submit that an additional ground exists for concluding that the invention defined by claim 12 is not obvious over the combination of HENDRICKS and KUNII.

In view of the above discussion, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over HENDRICKS in view of KUNII, submitting that the combination of references fails to render the claimed subject matter obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over HENDRICKS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,853) in view of KUNII (U.S. Patent No. 7,095,402 B2), and further in view of HIROSE (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0217167 A1). Applicants submit that HIROSE fails to disclose or suggest that which is discussed above as lacking in HENDRICKS and KUNII. Claim 11 depends from dependent claim 10, which is dependent on independent claim 8. Accordingly, all of the arguments presented above with respect to claim 8 apply herein. Thus, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, submitting that the combination of HENDRICKS, KUNII, and HIROSE fails to render the claimed subject matter obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.


SUMMARY

From the amendments, arguments and remarks provided above, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims in the present application are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action is respectfully requested and an indication of the allowance of claims 1-12 is now believed to be appropriate.

Applicants note that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance, and should not be considered as surrendering equivalents of the territory between the claims prior to the present amendment and the amended claims. Further, no acquiescence as to the propriety of the examiner's rejections is made by the present amendment. All other amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Koji HIROSE et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29027

September 25, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Steven Wegman
Reg. No. 31,438